A CORRECTION IN NOMENCLATURE

Howard J. Banker

In the second edition of the *Species Plantarum* in 1763, Linnaeus described a fungus which he called *Hydnum parasiticum* as follows: "acaule arcuato-rugosum tomentosum. Habitat in Europae arboribus." This appears to be the original publication of the species and Linnaeus never furnished any more complete account of the plant. It seems practically impossible from so meager a characterization to identify the plant thus named. In later editions of the *Species Plantarum* the name and description are continued unchanged. In 1769, a plant was figured in *Flora Danica pl. 465,* which was supposed to be the Linnaean species. The figure, however, fails to give any more definite characters of the plant. In the same year Weigel quotes the Linnaean species and appends a more elaborate description.* The fact that he states that the plant described by him is at first gelatinous raises the question whether he really had the Linnaean plant. In 1787, Willdenow described a plant† which he doubtfully referred to *Hydnum parasiticum* L. and the next year he repudiated his determination by figuring and describing his plant as a new species with the name *Agaricus decipiens.*‡ It seems evident, therefore, that even the earlier botanists were more or less in doubt as to the identity of the Linnaean plant.

About 1800, Olof Swartz sent to Persoon a specimen from Sweden which he affirmed to be the true *Hydnum parasiticum* L. This plant Persoon figured and fully described under the Linnaean name in his *Icones et Descriptiones Fungorum* 2: 55. *pl. 14, f. 2.* 1800. The figure is so well executed that it leaves no doubt as to the plant represented. Soon after this was published Swartz wrote Persoon, according to the latter, that the plant was not the *Hydnum parasiticum* of Linnaeus. Persoon now did a

* Flora Pomerano-Rugica, *222.* 1769.

† Florae Berolinensis Prodromus, 396. 1787.

‡ Observationes Botanicae in Mag. für die Bot. *12. pl. 2, f. a, b, c.* 1788.

peculiar thing. He published the Swartzian plant in his *Synopsis Methodica Fungorum,* in 1801, as *Hydnum parasiticum,* but stated that it was not *Hydnum parasiticum* L. Persoon appears to have disposed of the Linnaean plant by transferring it to the genus *Sistotrema,* for he says, "quod vide sub *Sistotremate,*" but in his treatment of the genus *Sistotrema* there is no citation of the Linnaean species and none of the descriptions seem to apply to that form. From this date the Linnaean plant appears to have been disregarded by botanists.

In 1810, Swartz himself described the plant which he had sent to Persoon and named it *Hydnum strigosum.** Neither Swartz nor the later European botanists have laid any special emphasis on the branched processes which are a peculiar characteristic of the body of this Swartzian plant, although this feature is figured and mentioned by Persoon; nor have we noted any mention of the hot, peppery taste of the fresh plant, which is a striking and characteristic feature.

About 1840 or a little later, T. G. Lea collected in Ohio a resupinate plant which in other respects possessed all the characteristic features of *H. strigosum* Sw. This was sent to Rev. M. J. Berkeley, of England, who described it in 1845 as *Hydnum stratosum.*† Berkeley commented extensively on the unique feature of the branched processes, remarking that it was one of the most remarkable species with which he was acquainted. He likens the plant to "*Hydnum parasiticum,*" but says it "has not like that a coriaceous pileus." His citation of name without author has in this case little significance. If he referred to *H. parasiticum* Pers., it was the same as *H. strigosum* Sw., but in that case his comment is misleading, since the structure and substance of the pilei of *H. strigosum* Sw. and *H. stratosum* Berk. are essentially alike and both are characterized by the branched processes.

H. stratosum Berk. appears never to have been reported from Europe and seems to be rare in this country. A. P. Morgan, who lived and collected in the same region of Ohio where Lea did, commented many years later on the fact that *H. stratosum* Berk.

* Kongl. Vetensk. Acad. nya Handl. 1810: 250. 1810.

† Lond. Jour. Bot. 4: 307. 1845.

had never been found again and expressed serious doubt as to its existence.* However, the plant does exist and is a good species. In 1887, Underwood and Cook found specimens in central New York which were correctly determined by C. H. Peck as *H. stratosum* Berk., and again Underwood found a specimen of the same species in Indiana in 1891. So far as the writer can determine, these three collections are the only ones made of this species in the world.

In 1904, the writer, searching through the vast accumulation of the Ellis collection at the New York Botanical Garden, discovered a specimen which he recognized as having the fundamental characters of *H. stratosum* Berk., but it was distinctly pileate. This specimen was collected by Ellis as early as 1855, and had been submitted to Ravenel, who replied "new and very curious." The plants, however, had never been described, probably because the material was scanty. Later specimens having the branched character greatly obscured by a more compact pileus were referred by Ellis to *H. strigosum* Sw. It was the writer's fortune the next summer after seeing these specimens to find a fine growth of the plant on an old stump in a deep, moist hollow at Schaghticoke, N. Y., where an abundance of fresh material was obtained.† The possibility of the plant's being *H. strigosum* Sw. was considered, but authentic material of Swartz's plant could not be obtained, and at that time a copy of Persoon's paper, *Icones et Descriptiones Fungorum,* was not accessible. The failure of the European botanists to emphasize the most unique feature of the plant and especially Berkeley's comment on that feature led the author to believe that the plant represented a distinct species. Moreover, the unusual character seemed to warrant the segregation of this and Berkeley's species as a separate genus. The plant was, therefore, described and named *Leaia piperata.*‡

Recently, among some material received from Dr. Lars Romell, of Sweden, were found a few specimens of what is there con-

* Jour. Cin. Soc. Nat. Hist. 10: 9. 1887.

† This old stump has continued to furnish a crop of the sporophores every year since, this being the sixth consecutive season that they have been observed.

‡ Mem. Torrey Club 12: 175. 1906.

sidered *Hydnum strigosum* Sw. These were at once recognized as being the same as *Leaia piperata*. A copy of Persoon's *Icones et Descriptiones Fungorum* was examined during the past summer and it was evident that the two species were identical. In the publication of the writer's Contribution to a revision of the North American Hydnaceae,* it seemed necessary to include *Hydnum strigosum* Sw., although the species was not well understood, since there had been found in the Schweinitz herbarium a peculiar plant that had been referred to the above species, and correctly, so far as could be determined. On the evidence of the Schweinitz specimen and the supposedly correct interpretation of Swartz's description, the species was placed in the genus *Steccherinum* and inadequately described, as was intimated at the time. It now seems doubtful if the Schweinitz specimen is the true *Hydnum strigosum* Sw., but a reëxamination of the plant would be necessary to positively settle the question. Be that as it may, it is now evident that the Swartzian species was wrongly disposed of.

With the settling of the question as to what constituted the true *H. strigosum* Sw., a new problem arose. The writer had made his species *Leaia piperata* the type of a new genus. With the determination of the identity of his plant with the Swartzian species, it is evident that the latter becomes the type of the genus. However, in 1879, P. A. Karsten had established the genus *Gloiodon* on *Hydnum strigosum* Sw. and two other species.† Ten years later he established the monotypic genus *Sclerodon* on *H. strigosum* Sw., quoting his own genus *Gloiodon* as a synonym.‡ In accordance with the principles here followed,§ the genus must be known as *Gloiodon*.

The correct nomenclature of the two species here discussed, with their synonomy, would, therefore, be as follows:

GLOIODON STRIGOSUS (Sw.) P. Karst., Medd. Soc. Faun. et Fl. Fenn. 5: 28. 1879.

* Mem. Torrey Club 12: 99–194. 1906.

† Medd. Soc. Faun. et Fl. Fenn. 5: 28. 1879.

‡ Finlands Basids. 360. 1889.

§ See Banker, A historical review of the proposed genera of the Hydnaceae, Bull. Torrey Club 29: 436–448. 1902.

Hydnum parasiticum Persoon, Icon. et Descrip. Fung. **2**: 55. *pl. 14, f. 2.* 1800. Not *H. parasiticum* L. Sp. Pl. ed. 2, **2**: 1648. 1763.

Hydnum strigosum Swartz, Kongl. Vetensk. Acad. nya Handl. **1810**: 250. 1810.

Sclerodon strigosus (Sw.) P. Karst., Finl. Basidsv. 361. 1889.

Steccherinum strigosus (Sw.) Banker, Mem. Torrey Club **12**: 128. 1906.

Leaia piperata Banker, Mem. Torrey Club **12**: 175. 1906.

Gloiodon stratosus (Berk.) comb. nov.

Hydnum stratosum Berkeley, Lond. Jour. Bot. **4**: 307. 1845.

Leaia stratosa (Berk.) Banker, Mem. Torrey Club **12**: 177. 1906.

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY,
GREENCASTLE, IND.